DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 081 359 HE 004 526

AUTHOR Williamson, W. J.
TITLE The Commuting Student Study, Report VI: Recreation Space.
INSTITUTION Alberta Univ., Edmonton. Office of Institutional Research and Planning.
PUB DATE Mar 72
NOTE 37p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS College Students; Commuting Students; *Higher Education; *Leisure Time; *Physical Facilities; *Recreation; *Recreational Facilities; Research Projects
IDENTIFIERS *University Of Alberta

ABSTRACT

This report presents a detailed analysis of the recreational space at the University of Alberta. The recreational facilities were assessed according to the use and satisfaction of facilities as stated by the students surveyed in a space facilities questionnaire, perceived needs as stated by the students, and discrepancies between existing facilities and the perceived needs. Study findings indicate: (1) a need for additional recreational space in the form of simple decentralized recreational rooms close to the various hubs of commuting student educational activities; (2) a need for improved campus communications regarding recreational organizations and events; (3) an increasing importance of indoor recreational activities with the onset of winter; and (4) the need for increased recognition of the importance of recreational facilities. Appendices of related material are included. Related documents are HE 004 491, HE 004 492, HE 004 493, and HE 004 494. (MJM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 087554

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 007 026

OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND PLANNING
THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA EDMONTON 7, ALBERTA

ED 081359

THE COMMUTING STUDENT STUDY

1970/71

REPORT VI -- RECREATION SPACE

SUBMITTED BY

WM. J. WILLIAMSON, RESEARCH OFFICER

OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND PLANNING

MARCH, 1972

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	MAJOR CONCLUSIONS	2
III.	CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE	3
IV.	BRIEF EXAMINATION OF THE TIME QUESTION	10
V.	DETAILED EXAMINATION OF RECREATION FACILITIES	13
	A. Use and Satisfaction with Major Recreation Facilities	15
VI.	STUDENT ORGANIZATION PARTICIPATION	22
VII.	CORE QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS	24
VIII.	CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	28
APPENDIX I:	RESPONSES TO CORE QUESTIONS RELATING TO RECREATION OR ORGANIZED ACTIVITY SPACES	30

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	Faculty Distribution of Survey Respondents cf. Total University Enrolment	5
II.	Age and Sex Distribution of Survey Respondents cf. Total University Enrolment	6
III.	Marital Status of Survey Respondents cf. University Enrolment	7
IV.	Home Address (Origin) of Survey Respondents cf. Total University Enrolment	8
V.	Survey Respondents Place of Residence	9
VI.	Student Informal Campus Time Distribution I	11
VII.	Student Informal Campus Time Distribution II	12
VIII.	Student Informal Campus Time Distribution III (Units are Students)	14
IX.	Use-Importance and Satisfaction Summary — Physical Education Building	16
X.	Use-Importance and Satisfaction Summary -- Students' Union Building	17
XI.	Student Recreation Facilities Use-Importance by Faculty -- Physical Education Building	19
XII.	Student Recreation Facilities Use-Importance by Faculty -- Students' Union Building	20
XIII.	Student Organization Participation	23
XIV.	Student Reasons for Limited Organizational Participation	24
XV.	Student Reasons for Time Limitations to Organizational Participation	25

TABLE PAGE

XVI. Summary of Responses in Areas of Complaint Question 69 Sample I & II 27

APPENDIX I: Responses to Core Questions Relating to Recreation or Organized Activity Spaces 31

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study, as one in a series of campus informal student space studies, was conceived and performed by the Office of Institutional Research and Planning, in response to an apparent need in the long range development plan of the University of Alberta. Gratefully acknowledged is the valuable assistance provided by Dr. Wm. A. Preshing, Dr. David Otto, Mr. Ken Coull, Mr. George Zaharia, Miss Judy Brunt and Mr. Bill Buxton. Without their help this study would not have been possible. Thanks also goes to Mrs. Minnie Cutts who typed this report.

The cooperation of Administrative Data Processing has been very important to the study and is greatly appreciated. Last but not least, our sincere thanks to the students who completed the questionnaire and shared with us their views and experiences on campus life.

THE COMMUTING STUDENT STUDY

REPORT VI -- RECREATION SPACE

I. INTRODUCTION

The University of Alberta has traditionally been thought of as a residential institution. In fact, as early as 1911, when Athabasca Hall was built it housed both staff and students as well as serving as a library, gymnasium and administrative office for the three-year-old University. Since that time the University has undergone a massive change. The enrolment has mushroomed from 185 students in 1911 to 18,336 in 1971. The growth of the metro Edmonton area has been extensive and as these changes manifest themselves it is necessary for the University to change so as to meet the needs. Whereas in 1911, when the first residence was built, 23% of the students were in residence, in 1971 only 12% of those enrolled lived in on-campus residences. It is apparent that some consideration, because of this shift from a resident institution to a non-resident one, must be given in the planning and development of facilities responsive to commuting student needs including recreational needs.

With these thoughts in mind the Office of Institutional Research and Planning has undertaken a critical examination of the commuting student phenomenon on the University of Alberta campus. In our study we have attempted to look at the time students spend on campus outside of the classroom. We have tried to separate the resident from the non-resident student in anticipation that the space needs of these two groups although similar, are not the same.

The initial report, Patterns in University Commuting (June, 1971), indicated the following trends: (1) an increase in commuters using all modes of transportation but especially the bus which in most cases increased the amount of commuting time, (2) an increase in the number of students in the 25+ age group, and an increase in the number of married students with added family responsibilities, and (3) an increase in the demand for jobs both on and off campus. It can be concluded from these findings that an effort must be made to deal with the change in student patterns of University life. A final report will deal with the behavioural aspects of these changes.

II. MAJOR CONCLUSIONS

Report VI -- Recreational Space will concentrate on the students use of on-campus recreational facilities. These facilities were investigated in the following manner: (i) assessment of use and satisfaction of existing recreational facilities as stated by the students surveyed in the space facilities questionnaire, (ii) an assessment of the perceived needs as stated by the students for recreation facilities, and (iii) a brief look at the discrepancies between the existing facilities or services and the type students feel they need. Major study findings are as follows:

1. There is a need for additional recreational space in the form of simple decentralized recreational rooms close to the various hubs of commuting student educational activities.

2. There is a need for improved campus communications regarding recreational organizations and events. With improvements more students will

benefit.

3. As outdoor recreation comes to a halt with the onset of winter, indoor recreational activities take on new importance.

4. Campus recreational space, unlike eating or lounging space, receives a constant proportion of students' available informal campus time, thus stressing the importance of recreational facilities.

III. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE

The essential information necessary to perform the commuting student study was obtained by administering a questionnaire designed and pre-tested by the planners. The first sample was obtained February 22nd through March 10th, 1971, at which time 31% of every eight students selected from the student master file completed the questionnaire. This resulted in 694 usable questionnaires.

From April 1st to May 15th, 1971, a second and final survey sample was obtained by means of a mail-out questionnaire, resulting in 588 usable questionnaires. These were obtained by a further random selection of students from the student master file. Thus a combined total of 1,282 usable questionnaires were obtained, subsequently analyzed, and form the basis for the following information and the report in general.

Tables I through V compare the students surveyed by the questionnaire with the total University full-time day-winter session enrolment of 1970-71. Inspection of these tables show that, generally, the commuting student sample is representative of the University enrolment. Specifically,

Table I shows all faculties to be well represented in the survey with the possible exception of students from the professional faculties including Dentistry, Medicine and Graduate Studies.

With regards to Table II, the age of those students surveyed was generally older (mean survey age 20.5 years) than the related total University enrolment. This was interpreted as a definite asset, as the students surveyed had experienced University space facilities for a longer period of time. Of the students surveyed, more female students were involved relative to the total University enrolment.

Table III indicated that relatively more single students were surveyed at 82.1% of the sample, than there were enrolled at the University at 73.1%. Thus a disproportionately low number of married students were surveyed at 17.9% compared to all married students at 26.9%.

Table IV, which shows the home origin of students surveyed in relation to the total University enrolment, indicates that 88% of the students surveyed are Albertans, an additional 4.5% are Canadians, and 7.5% are foreign students. The survey sample, therefore is quite representative of the University enrolment regarding home origin, with the minor exception of a slightly heavier proportion of foreign students.

Table V, which shows the place of residence of students surveyed, indicates that 14.5% of the sample are on-campus residence students. More specifically, with respect to the very nature of this study 85% of those students surveyed live off-campus and are commuting from the various city points.

TABLE I

THE COMMUTING STUDENT STUDY

1970/71

Faculty Distribution of Survey Respondents cf. Total University Enrolment

FACULTY	TOTAL SURVEY		TOTAL UNIVERSITY ENROLMENT*	
	No. of Students	% of Survey	No. of Students	% of Total
Arts	265	20.7	3,091	16.9
Agriculture	30	2.3	422	2.3
Business Administration & Commerce	75	5.9	1,118	6.1
College St. Jean	1	0.1	88	0.5
Dental Hygiene	3	0.2	50	0.3
Dentistry	4	0.3	197	1.1
Education	309	24.1	4,236	23.1
Engineering	98	7.6	1,380	7.5
Home Economics	29	2.3	324	1.7
Law	14	1.1	366	2.0
Library Science	-	-	44	0.2
Medical Laboratory Science	8	0.6	88	0.5
Medicine	23	1.8	589	3.2
Nursing	16	1.2	240	1.3
Pharmacy	15	1.2	303	1.6
Physical Education	28	2.2	598	3.3
Rehabilitation Medicine	27	2.1	215	1.2
Science	225	17.6	2,830	15.4
Graduate Studies	112	8.7	2,157	11.8
TOTAL STUDENTS	1,282	100.0%	18,336	100.0%

*Based on Registrar's data.

TABLE II

THE COMMUTING STUDENT STUDY

1970/71

Age and Sex Distribution of Survey Respondents cf. Total University Enrolment

AGE	NO. OF MALE STUDENTS	NO. OF FEMALE STUDENTS	TOTAL STUDENTS		NO. OF MALE STUDENTS	NO. OF FEMALE STUDENTS	TOTAL UNIVERSITY ENROLMENT*	
			No.	%			No.	%
16 to 19 years	122	135	257	20.0	2,896	2,853	5,749	31.3
20 to 21 years	215	234	449	35.0	2,879	2,208	5,087	27.7
22 to 25 years	233	117	350	27.3	3,272	1,048	4,320	23.6
26 to 30 years	91	34	125	9.8	1,472	379	1,851	10.1
31 to 40 years	52	29	81	6.3	676	312	988	5.4
41 to 50 years	7	8	15	1.2	142	147	289	1.6
Over 51 years	1	4	5	0.4	18	34	52	.3
TOTAL STUDENTS	721 - 56.2%	561 - 43.8%	1,282	100.0%	11,355 - 61.9%	6,981 - 28.1%	18,336	100.0%

*Based on Registrar's data.

TABLE III

THE COMMUTING STUDENT STUDY

1970/71

Marital Status of Survey Respondents cf. University Enrolment

MARITAL STATUS	TOTAL SURVEY		TOTAL UNIVERSITY ENROLMENT*	
	No. of Students	%	No. of Students	%
Single	1,052	82.1	13,396	73.1
Married	230	17.9	4,940	26.9
TOTAL STUDENTS	1,282	100.0%	18,336	100.0%

*Based on Registrar's data.

TABLE IV

THE COMMUTING STUDENT STUDY

1970/71

Home Address (Origin) of Survey Respondents cf. Total University Enrolment

GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION	TOTAL SURVEY		TOTAL UNIVERSITY ENROLMENT*	
	No.	%	No.	%
Edmonton	728	56.8	11,336	61.8
Urban Alberta	193	15.1	2,569	14.0
Rural Alberta	207	16.1	2,435	13.3
Other Canada	58	4.5	1,123	6.1
United States	8	0.6	108	.6
Central and South America	5	0.4	76	.4
Europe and South Pacific	23	1.8	65	.4
Asia	52	4.1	520	2.8
Africa and Middle East	8	0.6	104	.6
TOTAL STUDENTS	1,282	100.0%	18,336	100.0%

*Based on Registrar's data.

TABLE V

THE COMMUTING STUDENT STUDY

1970/71

Survey Respondents Place of Residence

LOCATION	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	PERCENT
University Residence	186	14.5
Home	592	46.2
Apartment	266	20.7
Suite or Sleeping Room	127	9.9
Student Coop Housing	25	2.0
Other	74	5.8
No Response	12	0.9
TOTAL STUDENTS	1,282	100.0%

From examination of the five tables, it would appear that the respondents surveyed represent the University students' attitudes toward campus informal student space needs. The exception to this would appear to be a light return from the students of certain of the professional faculties, many of whom are very likely as much or more in need of study and recreation space as those students surveyed. The intramural sports score board kept in the Physical Education Building is a reliable indication of the above suggested need with Medicine, Dentistry and Law high in the standings.

IV. BRIEF EXAMINATION OF THE TIME QUESTION

The key question regarding the use of free time dealt with (a) the amount of time spent on campus engaged in free time activities, and (b) what percentage of this free time was spent in the use of study, eating, lounging, recreation and commercial facilities on campus. Student informal campus time distribution (Tables VI, VII and VII) highlight the student informal time findings.

From Table VI it can be noted that the average student surveyed spends approximately fifteen hours of informal time on campus, an important weekly informal time allocation. It can further be noted from the study that many of those students who spend less than the average time are tied down with personal responsibilities such as jobs and probably would spend more time on campus if they could.

Table VII indicates that recreation time, which includes a wide range

TABLE VI

THE COMMUTING STUDENT STUDY

1970/71

Student Informal Campus Time Distribution I

TIME ALLOCATION	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS
Less than 3 Hours Per Week	78	6.1
From 3 to 6 Hours Per Week	232	18.1
From 6 to 12 Hours Per Week	206	16.1
From 12 to 24 Hours Per Week	355	27.6
From 24 to 36 Hours Per Week	228	17.8
From 36 to 48 Hours Per Week	67	5.2
More than 48 Hours Per Week	78	6.1
No Response	38	3.0
TOTAL STUDENTS	1,282	100.0%

TABLE VII

THE COMMUTING STUDENT STUDY

1970/71

Student Informal Campus Time Distribution II

INFORMAL TIME USE CATEGORIES	AVERAGE TIME ALLOCATION IN PERCENT BY SURVEY RESPONDENTS						TOTAL PERCENT AND STUDENTS	
	Studying	Eating	Lounging	Recreation	Service and Commercial	Other	%	Students
From 0 to 12 Hours Per Week	42.3	19.0	21.7	10.2	2.7	4.1	100	516
From 12 to 24 Hours Per Week	49.8	14.3	18.7	10.0	1.9	5.3	100	355
From 24 to 36 Hours Per Week	54.0	12.8	16.6	10.0	2.4	4.2	100	288
From 36 to 48 Hours Per Week	57.1	11.0	12.6	9.6	3.1	6.6	100	67
Sub Total Average	50.8	14.3	17.4	10.0	2.5	5.0	100	N/A
More than 48 Hours Per Week	50.5	8.8	11.6	11.1	3.3	14.7	100	78
Grand Total Average	50.7	13.2	16.2	10.2	2.7	7.0	100	N/A
TOTAL STUDENTS								1,244
No Response								38
TOTAL STUDENTS SURVEYED								1,282

TABLE VIII

THE COMMUTING STUDENT STUDY

1970-71

Student Informal Campus Time Distribution III (Units are Students)

FACULTY	TIME ALLOCATION							TOTAL STUDENTS
	Less than 3 Hours Per Week	From 3 to 6 Hours Per Week	From 6 to 12 Hours Per Week	From 12 to 24 Hours Per Week	From 24 to 36 Hours Per Week	From 36 to 48 Hours Per Week	More than 48 Hours Per Week	
Agriculture	0	6	3	12	6	0	0	27 - 2.5%
Arts	13	35	39	86	44	9	5	231 - 21.1%
Business Administration & Commerce	2	10	9	15	17	9	3	65 - 5.9%
College St. Jean	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1 - .1%
Dental Hygiene	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1 - .1%
Dentistry	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	4 - .4%
Education	21	67	51	73	49	7	5	273 - 25.0%
Engineering	1	14	10	30	20	4	4	83 - 7.6%
Graduate Studies	13	13	6	20	15	17	12	96 - 8.8%
Household Economics	0	4	9	7	2	1	0	23 - 2.1%
Law	1	0	0	4	4	1	2	12 - 1.1%
Medical Laboratory Science	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	6 - .5%
Medicine	5	7	5	4	1	0	1	23 - 2.1%
Nursing	0	4	3	6	1	0	0	14 - 1.3%
Pharmacy	0	1	1	3	3	0	0	8 - .7%
Physical Education	0	2	1	10	7	2	0	22 - 2.0%
Rehabilitation Medicine	1	3	5	4	6	1	1	21 - 1.9%
Science	7	26	37	56	38	13	7	184 - 16.8%
TOTAL	65 - 5.8%	199 - 18.2%	180 - 16.5%	331 - 30.3%	215 - 19.7%	64 - 5.8%	40 - 3.7%	1,094 - 100%

of games, clubs, etc., such as bridge or billiards, athletics, teams, clubs and other campus organizations, receive 10% of available informal time. Of particular significance, however, is that the percentage of recreation time, unlike lounging and eating time, does not decline at increasing levels of campus informal time allocations. This implies higher relative utility at higher levels of student informal time allocations in relation to other informal activities, thus stressing the importance of recreational facilities.

Table VIII, which shows the student informal campus time distribution by faculty, indicates the predictable heavy academic nature (heavy workloads --hence more on-campus informal time) of certain faculties, such as Graduate Studies. Particular activities such as student teaching, Graduate Teaching Assistant employment and hospital experience could be the reason for the low campus informal time expenditure for certain Education, Graduate and Medical students.

V. DETAILED EXAMINATION OF RECREATION FACILITIES

In keeping with reported recreational time allocations students use various spaces all over campus--literally wherever it is convenient to initiate a game of bridge or table tennis, or a spontaneous touch football game. As such, the Central Academic Building including the Math lounge, the Education gym, the Physical Education track and field, the tennis courts, the Lister Hall recreation room, out of doors, own home, bowling alleys, offices, fraternities, clubs and bars were all mentioned as useful recreational places.

In the process of obtaining a large enough student response to

ascertain adequacy on any given campus space, the Physical Education Building and the Students' Union Building recreational facilities clearly emerge as the two major recreational areas on campus by an overwhelming margin. We shall therefore examine the use-importance and degree of satisfaction with these facilities. We shall deal with a number of issues that relate to certain facilities specifically and campus recreation in general, and we shall conclude with an assessment of study findings to suggest how recreation activities and space might be assisted and/or planned for more effectively.

A. Use and Satisfaction with Major Recreation Facilities

An examination of the recreational facilities use and satisfaction Tables IX and X will provide the reader with detailed student responses upon which the following comments are based.

Of the two major recreation areas on campus the Physical Education complex was reported as the highest use-importance facility by a significant margin, at 22.5% in the high use-importance category as opposed to 8.3% for the Students' Union Building.

In terms of overall use-importance, Physical Education again surpassed the Students' Union Building at 56.2% to 51.0% with comparable numbers of students who don't use either.

An examination of reported satisfaction at the high use-importance level (Tables IX and X) is in keeping with the use findings indicating that there is more satisfaction with Physical Education than the Students' Union Building at 94.4% to 86.8%. This trend holds true for all levels of

TABLE IX

USE-IMPORTANCE AND SATISFACTION SUMMARY

Physical Education Building

	USE-IMPORTANCE OF FACILITIES		NUMERICAL AND PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF USE-IMPORTANCE CATEGORY BY DEGREE OF SATISFACTION							
			SATISFIED		NEITHER		DISSATISFIED		TOTALS	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
High	288	22.5	272	94.4	4	1.4	12	4.2	288	100
Medium	242	18.9	224	92.6	9	3.7	9	3.7	242	100
Low	190	14.8	147	77.4	37	19.4	6	3.2	190	100
SUB-TOTAL	720	56.2								
Don't Use	493	38.5	28	5.7	458	92.9	7	1.4	493	100
No Response	69	5.4							69	
TOTAL	1,282	100.0							1,282	

SATISFACTION WITH FACILITIES			SATISFACTION SUMMARY		
	Number	Percent		Number	Percent
Very Satisfied	301	23.5	Positive Satisfaction	647	50.5
Satisfied	346	27.0			
Neither	293	22.9	Neutral	293	22.9
Dissatisfied	16	1.2	Negative Satisfaction	32	2.4
Very Dissatisfied	16	1.2			
No Response	310	24.2	No Response	310	24.2

TABLE X

USE-IMPORTANCE AND SATISFACTION SUMMARY

Students' Union Building

	USE-IMPORTANCE OF FACILITIES		NUMERICAL AND PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF USE-IMPORTANCE CATEGORY BY DEGREE OF SATISFACTION							
			SATISFIED		NEITHER		DISSATISFIED		TOTALS	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
High	106	8.3	92	86.8	4	3.8	10	9.4	106	100
Medium	254	19.8	209	82.3	27	10.6	18	7.1	254	100
Low	294	22.9	186	63.3	86	29.3	22	7.4	294	100
SUB-TOTAL	654	51.0								
Don't Use	529	41.3	34	6.4	478	90.4	17	3.2	529	100
No Response	99	7.7							99	
TOTAL	1,282	100.0							2,282	

SATISFACTION WITH FACILITIES			SATISFACTION SUMMARY		
	Number	Percent		Number	Percent
Very Satisfied	105	8.2	Positive Satisfaction	491	38.3
Satisfied	386	30.1			
Neither	374	29.2	Neutral	374	29.2
Dissatisfied	43	3.4	Negative Satisfaction	59	4.6
Very Dissatisfied	16	1.2			
No Response	358	27.9	No Response	358	27.9

use-importance. It is interesting to note that at the same level of use-importance, dissatisfaction with Physical Education is half of that for the Students' Union Building at 4.2% versus 9.4%. This greater dissatisfaction with the Students' Union Building may be a result of the overcrowding of facilities which exists there. For those students who don't use Physical Education or the Students' Union Building recreation facilities, there is a low dissatisfaction rate at 1.5% and 3.2% respectively, indicating there are other reasons for the disuse of the recreation facilities such as shortage of time.

Tables XI and XII show the respondents usage of the recreational facilities in Physical Education and the Students' Union Building by faculty. The first half of the table shows faculty usage of the facilities as a percentage of the total for each use category. The second half of the table expresses faculty usage as a percentage of the total respondents within that faculty.

It is interesting to note that by the Row Per Cent, Arts, Education and Science appear as the heaviest users of the recreational facilities in both Physical Education and the Students' Union Building. This could be expected since these are the three largest faculties on campus, and they are well represented in the study. The main object here is to show the faculty make-up of the different levels of use-importance.

When one examines the Column Per Cent tables, different faculties emerge as the heavy users. Students from Physical Education, Rehabilitation Medicine, Dentistry and Medicine have the highest use-importance of the Physical Education Building facilities, with students from Agriculture,

TABLE XI

STUDENT RECREATION FACILITIES USE-IMPORTANCE BY FACULTY

Physical Education Building

A. Reported in Number of Students and Row Percent

FACULTY	DEGREES OF USE									
	HIGH		MEDIUM		LOW		TOTAL USE		DON'T USE	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Agriculture	4	1.7	5	2.5	8	4.8	17	2.8	7	1.5
Arts	41	17.0	39	19.8	35	21.1	115	19.0	111	24.2
Business Administration & Commerce	16	6.6	18	9.1	6	3.6	40	6.6	26	5.7
College St. Jean	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.2
Dental Hygiene	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.2
Dentistry	1	0.4	2	1.0	0	0.0	3	0.5	1	0.2
Education	38	15.8	33	16.8	38	22.9	109	18.1	147	32.0
Engineering	24	10.0	12	6.1	16	9.6	52	8.6	28	6.1
Graduate Studies	27	11.2	23	11.7	16	9.6	66	10.9	32	7.0
Household Economics	4	1.7	1	0.5	2	1.2	7	1.2	17	3.7
Law	2	0.8	4	2.0	2	1.2	8	1.3	4	0.9
Medical Laboratory Science	1	0.4	2	1.0	1	0.6	4	0.7	3	0.7
Medicine	7	2.9	8	4.1	2	1.2	17	2.8	6	1.3
Nursing	1	0.4	1	0.5	1	0.6	3	0.5	8	1.7
Pharmacy	2	0.8	2	1.0	0	0.0	4	0.7	3	0.7
Physical Education	20	8.3	0	0.0	3	1.8	23	3.8	0	0.0
Rehabilitation Medicine	6	2.5	5	2.5	7	4.2	18	3.0	3	0.7
Science	47	19.5	42	21.3	29	17.5	118	19.5	61	13.3
TOTAL	241	100.0	197	100.0	166	100.0	604	100.0	459	100.0

B. Reported in Number of Students and Column Percent

FACULTY	DEGREES OF USE											
	HIGH		MEDIUM		LOW		TOTAL USE		DON'T USE		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Agriculture	4	16.7	5	20.8	8	33.3	17	70.8	7	29.2	24	100.0
Arts	41	18.1	39	17.3	35	15.5	115	50.9	111	49.1	226	100.0
Business Administration & Commerce	16	24.2	18	27.3	6	9.1	40	60.6	26	39.4	66	100.0
College St. Jean	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	1	100.0
Dental Hygiene	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	1	100.0
Dentistry	1	25.0	2	50.0	0	0.0	3	75.0	1	25.0	4	100.0
Education	38	14.8	33	12.9	38	14.8	109	42.5	147	57.5	256	100.0
Engineering	24	30.0	12	15.0	16	20.0	52	65.0	28	35.0	80	100.0
Graduate Studies	27	27.6	23	23.5	16	16.3	66	67.4	32	32.6	98	100.0
Household Economics	4	16.7	1	4.2	2	8.3	7	29.2	17	70.8	24	100.0
Law	2	16.7	4	33.3	2	16.7	8	66.7	4	33.3	12	100.0
Medical Laboratory Science	1	14.3	2	28.6	1	14.3	4	57.2	3	42.8	7	100.0
Medicine	7	30.4	8	34.8	2	8.7	17	73.9	6	26.1	23	100.0
Nursing	1	9.1	1	9.1	1	9.1	3	27.3	8	72.7	11	100.0
Pharmacy	2	28.6	2	28.6	0	0.0	4	57.2	3	42.8	7	100.0
Physical Education	20	86.9	0	0.0	3	13.1	23	100.0	0	0.0	23	100.0
Rehabilitation Medicine	6	28.6	5	23.8	7	33.3	18	85.7	3	14.3	21	100.0
Science	47	26.3	42	23.5	29	16.2	118	66.0	61	34.0	179	100.0

TABLE XII

STUDENT RECREATION FACILITIES USE -- IMPORTANCE BY FACULTY

STUDENTS UNION BUILDING

A. Reported in Number of Students and Row Percent

FACULTY	DEGREES OF USE									
	HIGH		MEDIUM		LOW		TOTAL USE		DON'T USE	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Agriculture	3	3.4	6	2.9	6	2.3	15	2.7	6	1.2
Arts	14	15.9	41	19.7	53	20.7	108	19.6	114	23.5
Business Administration & Commerce	10	11.4	17	8.2	13	5.1	40	7.3	25	5.1
College St. Jean	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.2
Dental Hygiene	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.2
Dentistry	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.4	1	0.2	3	0.6
Education	14	15.9	49	23.6	53	20.7	116	21.0	135	27.8
Engineering	14	15.9	17	8.2	20	7.8	51	9.2	29	6.0
Graduate Studies	6	6.9	16	7.7	20	7.8	42	7.6	47	9.7
Household Economics	2	2.3	3	1.4	8	3.1	13	2.4	11	2.3
Law	1	1.1	1	0.5	4	1.6	6	1.1	6	1.2
Medical Laboratory Science	1	1.1	1	0.5	2	0.8	4	0.7	2	0.4
Medicine	1	1.1	4	1.9	6	2.3	11	1.9	10	2.1
Nursing	0	0.0	3	1.4	0	0.0	3	0.5	9	1.9
Pharmacy	0	0.0	1	0.5	1	0.4	2	0.4	4	0.8
Physical Education	3	3.4	4	1.9	12	4.7	19	3.4	4	0.8
Rehabilitation Medicine	3	3.4	3	1.4	4	1.6	10	1.9	12	2.5
Science	16	18.2	42	20.2	53	20.7	111	20.1	67	13.8
TOTAL	88	100.0	208	100.0	256	100.0	552	100.0	486	100.0

B. Reported in Number of Students and Column Percent

FACULTY	DEGREES OF USE											
	HIGH		MEDIUM		LOW		TOTAL USE		DON'T USE		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Agriculture	3	14.3	6	28.6	6	28.6	15	71.4	6	28.6	21	100.0
Arts	14	6.3	41	18.5	53	23.9	108	48.7	114	51.3	222	100.0
Business Administration & Commerce	10	15.4	17	26.2	13	20.0	40	61.5	25	38.5	65	100.0
College St. Jean	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	1	100.0
Dental Hygiene	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	1	100.0
Dentistry	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	1	25.0	3	75.0	4	100.0
Education	14	5.6	49	19.5	53	21.1	116	46.2	135	53.8	251	100.0
Engineering	14	17.5	17	21.3	20	25.0	51	63.8	29	36.2	80	100.0
Graduate Studies	6	6.7	16	18.0	20	22.5	42	47.2	47	52.8	89	100.0
Household Economics	2	8.3	3	12.5	8	33.3	13	54.1	11	45.9	24	100.0
Law	1	8.3	1	8.3	4	33.4	6	50.0	6	50.0	12	100.0
Medical Laboratory Science	1	16.7	1	16.7	2	33.3	4	66.7	2	33.3	6	100.0
Medicine	1	4.8	4	19.0	6	28.6	11	52.4	10	47.6	21	100.0
Nursing	0	0.0	3	25.0	0	0.0	3	25.0	9	75.0	12	100.0
Pharmacy	0	0.0	1	16.6	1	16.7	2	33.3	4	66.7	6	100.0
Physical Education	3	13.0	4	17.4	12	52.2	19	82.6	4	17.4	23	100.0
Rehabilitation Medicine	3	13.6	3	13.6	4	18.2	10	45.4	12	54.6	22	100.0
Science	16	9.0	42	23.6	53	29.8	111	62.4	67	37.6	178	100.0

Graduate Studies and Law close behind. Factors which could possibly produce this result are:

1. There exists for students a strong need of athletic-recreational space.

2. Students with a knowledge of the merits of physical exercise have a strong affinity to the facilities.

3. When the proximity-convenience factor for students is favorable, more use is made of the facilities.

4. There is a strong esprit de corps amongst students of certain faculties. An examination of the intramural sports standings will show that Medicine, Dentistry and Law are high in the University standings.

The study notes that Education students who have their own proper gymnasium and locker rooms, find Physical Education facilities of lower use-importance.

It is interesting to note that those faculties and schools with predominantly female enrolments including Nursing, Dental Hygiene and Household Economics display relatively low use-importance of the Physical Education facilities.

Again an examination of the Column Per Cent tables for the Students' Union Building indicates that Physical Education and Agriculture students find the facilities of considerable use-importance, with Engineering, Science, Commerce and Medical Laboratory Science students close behind. As for the Physical Education Building, factors which could possibly produce this result are:

1. There exists for students a substantial need for the Students'

Union Building type of recreational space (i.e., bowling, billiards, bridge, curling).

2. The proximity-convenience factor has a bearing on reported facilities use by Physical Education, Engineering and Commerce students.

In conclusion, two major points emerge regarding the possible explanation for the above overall use-importance patterns for the Physical Education Building and the Students' Union Building.

Firstly, the Physical Education Building offers a greater absolute quantity and variety of recreational space than does the Students' Union Building. It would generally appear that athletic recreational activities have higher use-importance than do "games type" of recreational activities. There is though, comparable overall numbers of students using both kinds of facilities with 720 students using Physical Education, and 654 Students' Union (Tables IX and X).

Secondly, a possible explanation for the lower use-importance of the Students' Union Building recreational facilities is that students tend to couple their recreation use of the building with other functions such as eating, lounging or shopping at the Bookstore. Further, the drawing power of the other building functions is likely producing crowding, particularly at meal time, such that one can't count on gaining immediate access to a game. The compartmentalized recreational activities in the Physical Education Building generally do not suffer from this problem.

VI. STUDENT ORGANIZATION PARTICIPATION

In the interests of focusing more clearly on the organizational

aspects of student recreation the planners asked the students participating in the commuting student study the following question: "How many athletic, social, cultural, or other organizations do you belong to both on and off campus?" Table XIII summarizes student response to the question and indicates, in general, a student preference for membership in one or two organizations both on and off campus.

TABLE XIII

STUDENT ORGANIZATION PARTICIPATION

NUMBER OF ORGANIZATIONS YOU BELONG TO	ON-CAMPUS		OFF-CAMPUS	
	Number of Students Reporting	Per Cent	Number of Students Reporting	Per Cent
1	366	28.5	304	23.7
2	177	13.8	154	12.0
3	33	2.6	69	5.4
4	12	.9	24	1.9
5	2	.2	10	.8
6 or more	5	.4	5	.4
No response	687	53.6	716	55.9
TOTAL STUDENTS	1,282	100.0%	1,282	100.0%

Of particular significance regarding Table XIII is the fact that over half the students surveyed did not respond whether or not they participate in organized (recreational or other) activities.

In anticipation that the above type of pattern might emerge from this study, the planners next asked the students: "If you belong to less than two organizations in all please describe why you do not belong to more."

Table XIV summarizes the response to this question, with no interest in organized activities and classwork emerging as the two most common reasons.

TABLE XIV

STUDENT REASONS FOR LIMITED ORGANIZATIONAL PARTICIPATION

REASON NUMBER AND RANK	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF STUDENTS COMMENTING
1	Personal Interests, Non-Organized Activities	44
2	Classwork	41
3	Friends	28
4	No Time	27
5	Would Like To Join	20
6	Not Interested	19
7	Don't Like Organizations	19
8	Job	17
9	Expense	16
10	Family	15
11	Commuting	12
12	Social Life	11

And last, the planners asked the question, "What limits your time in belonging to organizations?" with the results summarized in Table XV.

As could be expected, the pressures of pursuit of higher education and personal responsibilities rate high in limiting students' time. Additionally, it is safe to assume that many students simply are not joiners with respect to organized recreational, athletic and social activities, etc.

VII. CORE QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

To focus more clearly on student needs and aspirations and their

TABLE XV

STUDENT REASONS FOR TIME LIMITATIONS TO ORGANIZATIONAL PARTICIPATION

ITEM NUMBER AND RANK	DESCRIPTION	CHOICE 1	CHOICE 2	CHOICE 3 OR MORE	TOTAL
1	Classwork	490	108	25	623
2	Job	81	42	15	138
3	Personal Interests, Non-Organized Activities	42	54	28	124
4	Nothing	84	1	0	85
5	Family	37	32	9	78
6	Housework, Home Responsibilities	18	28	14	60
7	Commuting	29	25	5	59
8	Friends	15	31	10	56
9	Social Life	15	20	14	49
10	Other Organizations	26	18	4	48
11	Timetable	16	18	1	35
12	No Time	21	10	1	32
13	Go Home Weekends	10	7	2	19

personal experiences with campus life, a good portion of the planners' investigation involved examining student attitudes as they relate to the broad area of recreational space. Following are some of the statements posed and the corresponding results.

To the statement, "I would like to belong to more campus organizations than I do", 37.4% of those students surveyed said they would like to while 34.5% said no (Appendix I). Written comments substantiated this result by 55 positive comments to 22 and the previous Tables XIII to XV show both positive and negative reasons.

To the statement, "I find the facilities in the Physical Education Building available to me when I need them", agreement was recorded at 42.6% versus 11.8% negative. Written student comments however did not follow suit with 29 expressing disagreement to 27 in agreement. Those disagreeing cited

a shortage of basketballs, and restricted use of other equipment such as handball gloves and racquets as being reasons.

To the statement, "I miss opportunities to meet people at campus events because I cannot afford the price of admission", 57.7% of the students surveyed disagreed while 18.6% agreed. Written student comments were in keeping with this result by 28 to 21 but comments on the positive side did cite a shortage of money in 1970-71 (Appendix I).

To the statement, "Campus events are well publicized", 59.6% of the students surveyed agreed while 23.4% reported disagreement. Written comments by students surveyed, however, did not support this result by 30 to 23. A problem cited was the poor publicity of events. The fact that campus bulletin boards are often one big litter, and that posters go up the day before an activity, thus leaving little opportunity to plan ahead, also were cited as problems.

To the statement, "I try to avoid the Students' Union Building because of the crowds", 35.4% of the students surveyed agreed while 41.8% disagreed. Written student comments however reversed the above order with 37 agreeing to 28 disagreeing indicating that crowding is a problem which affects recreational facilities.

To the statement, "I am a strong supporter of several University of Alberta athletic teams", 26.6% of the students surveyed said they were while 45.4% were not. Written student comments indicated more support at 19 to 14, claiming varying degrees of support. Those who were not supporters suggested there is much better involvement with intramural sports where one

does the activity himself.

To the statement, "I am continually aware of activities and events scheduled on campus"; 47.5% of the students surveyed indicated that they were aware while 32.9% were not. Written student comments were equal at 14 each. The major problem associated with lack of awareness was that the publicity associated with activities was weak and often untimely.

Table XVI provides information on the question, "What student services are inadequate or totally absent at the University of Alberta?" As can be seen, indications are that recreational facilities were recorded as generally much more adequate than service and commercial or lounge space facilities. Those students who did comment on the question were concerned with the lack of Physical Education facilities in a number of areas (e.g., golf, covered tennis, covered football) as well as with present facilities, particularly shortage of locker space.

TABLE XVI

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES IN AREAS OF COMPLAINT
QUESTION 69 SAMPLE I & II

AREA OF COMPLAINT	I		II	
	Response	%	Response	%
A. Study Facilities	115	7.13	86	8.57
B. Eating	141	9.92	105	10.47
C. Lounge	186	12.53	129	12.86
D. Recreation	77	5.38	35	3.49
E. Service & Commercial	460	31.62	322	32.00
F. Environment	181	12.53	98	9.77
G. Academic	83	5.98	51	5.08
H. Transportation	194	13.37	155	15.45
I. Others	27	1.12	22	2.19
TOTAL	1,464		1,003	

VIII. CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The study's conclusion with regard to space needs is that there appears to be a shortage of certain types of recreational space on campus. These types are perhaps most like facilities found in the Students' Union Building such as games space, card playing space, club office space, music listening, meditation space, etc. Although these space shortages relate to a centralized facility, the study notes that unlike study, eating or lounging facilities, there is very little specific interior decentralized recreational space on campus. A few rooms for students comparable to the Lister Hall recreation room, placed close to decentralized student gathering places (e.g., Tory Building, Biological Sciences Building) may be worthy of consideration.
2. The study findings are that there is room for considerable improvement in the whole broad area of promotions, publicity and basic communication regarding campus organizational and recreational offerings. Since many students are commited quite heavily, time-and-responsibility-wise, adequate lead time to plan attending events is of the essence. There is considerable student dismay over untidy bulletin boards and miniscule advertisements, resulting in the absence of some students who might otherwise participate in or attend more recreational events.
3. Edmonton winters severely curtail outdoor student recreational activities (particularly athletic) thus making indoor facilities a necessity at a winter-session oriented campus.

4. The relative utility of campus recreational space facilities does not decline with increasing levels of student informal campus time allocations, unlike the pattern for eating or lounging space facilities. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that campus recreational facilities are very well used by students; not to mention faculty, staff and their families.

APPENDIX I

RESPONSES TO CORE QUESTIONS RELATING TO RECREATION OR ORGANIZED ACTIVITY SPACES

	QUESTION	COMMENTS		AGREEMENT		DISAGREEMENT	
18	Like to belong to more campus organizations	99	(7.7%)	480	(37.4%)	443	(34.5%)
22	Physical Education facilities available when needed	81	(6.3%)	546	(42.6%)	152	(11.8%)
28	I miss opportunities to meet people because of admission price	64	(5.0%)	239	(18.6%)	739	(57.7%)
35	Campus events are well publicized	70	(5.4%)	764	(59.6%)	300	(23.4%)
43	Avoid Students' Union Building because of the crowds	76	(6.0%)	453	(35.4%)	536	(41.8%)
45	Strong supporter of University of Alberta athletic teams	41	(3.1%)	343	(26.6%)	581	(45.4%)
47	Continually aware of campus events	34	(2.7%)	609	(47.5%)	422	(32.9%)

NOTE: Percentages shown in brackets are a product of the number based on the 1,282 respondents.